Replicating Analyses from "Morality and Politics: Comparing Alternate Theories"

Andrew Miles
Last updated: January 20, 2016

This document contains instructions for replicating the analyses in "Morality and Politics: Comparing Alternate Theories." All analyses were performed using R, which is free and can be obtained here: http://www.r-project.org/

Required R packages:

multilevel
Amelia
mitools
ltest
psych
sandwich
car

Files Needed:

Miles and Vaisey 2015 – functions.R
Miles and Vaisey 2015 – analyses.R

Data Needed:

Measuring Morality data (http://kenan.ethics.duke.edu/attitudes/resources/measuring-morality/)
NOTE: download the data in R format (.rdata extension)
Notre Dame Generosity Data subset – available on http://www.andrewamiles.com

Step-by-step instructions:

1. Download all replication files from www.andrewamiles.com and place them in a single folder on your computer.
2. Download the Measuring Morality data and place it in the same folder.
3. Open the file "Miles and Vaisey 2015 - analyses.R" and set the working directory to point to the folder. The line of code that you need to modify looks like this: setwd("PATH NAME TO FOLDER HERE")
4. Open R (if it is not already open) and run the file "Miles and Vaisey 2015 - analyses.R" – this will automatically run the script file "Miles and Vaisey 2015 – functions.R", and then run the data checks and analyses reported in the paper.

Users who wish to see the custom-functions written to handle unique data coding and analysis tasks should examine the file "Miles and Vaisey 2015 – functions.R" directly.

Note on Imputations: Because analyses use multiply imputed data, exact estimates and standard errors might differ slightly from the published results, but these differences should be minor. My pre-testing of these files suggests that the largest differences tend to involve the factor analyses and factor scores, but again, these are small in magnitude.

Note on Errors: These instructions work as of the date I posted them to my website, but it is possible that changes to R functions in the future, or even an unusual set of imputations, might result in errors. In this case, first try re-estimating the analyses. If the error persists, you will need to use R's debugging functions to locate the source of the error and correct it. A likely culprit is the constant updating of R

functions, which might make it so that some of the custom functions used in the analyses no longer work as they should.

Known differences from published results: When constructing these file I noticed that alpha coefficients for some scales differed slightly from the published figures. Also, the coefficients for the two *Divine authority* items in Table 5 show negative signs in the paper, but print out positive signs in the replication results. This is because the analyses in the published paper did not use the reverse coded versions of the scales, so higher values correspond to *less* conservatism. While this does not change the substantive results, it does differ from the coding of the divine authority scale used in the rest of the paper, and represents an oversight on my part.